

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
MEDFORD DIVISION

HUNTER TALON MARLOW,

Plaintiff,

No. 1:19-cv-00188-SB

v.

OPINION AND ORDER

SICKLER ERA et al.,

Defendants.

MOSMAN, J.,

On April 30, 2021, Magistrate Judge Stacie F. Beckerman issued her Amended Findings and Recommendation (F. & R.) [ECF 54]. Judge Beckerman recommends that I grant Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF 27]. Objections were due on May 14, 2021, but none were filed. I agree with Judge Beckerman.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a de novo determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of


the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F. & R. to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F. & R. depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F. & R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

CONCLUSION

Upon review, I agree with Judge Beckerman's recommendations, I ADOPT her F. & R. [ECF 54] as my own opinion, and I GRANT Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF 27].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 19th day of May, 2021.


MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
United States District Judge